arXiv:1210.4670v1 [math.OA] 17 Oct 2012

Completeness of n–tuple of projections in C^*–algebras

Shanwen Hu* and Yifeng Xue†
Department of mathematics and Research Center for Operator Algebras
East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, P.R. China

Abstract

Let $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ be an n–tuple of projections in a unital C^*–algebra $\mathcal{A}$. We say $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ is complete in $\mathcal{A}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ is the linear direct sum of the closed subspaces $P_1\mathcal{A}, \cdots, P_n\mathcal{A}$. In this paper, we give some necessary and sufficient conditions for the completeness of $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and discuss the perturbation problem and topology of the set of all complete n–tuple of projections in $\mathcal{A}$. Some interesting and significant results are obtained in this paper.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 46L05, 47B65
Key words: projection, idempotent, complete n–tuple of projections

0 Introduction

Throughout the paper, we always assume that H is a complex Hilbert space with inner product $< \cdot, \cdot >$, $B(H)$ is the C^*–algebra of all bounded linear operators on H and $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^*–algebra with the unit 1. Let $\mathcal{A}_+$ denote the set of all positive elements in $\mathcal{A}$. It is well–known that $\mathcal{A}$ has a faithful representation (ψ, H_ψ) with $\psi(1) = I$ (cf. [8, Theorem 1.6.17] or [17, Theorem 1.5.36]). For $T \in B(H)$, let $\mathrm{Ran}(T)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ker}(T)$) denote the range (resp. kernel) of T.

Let V_1, V_2 be closed subspaces in H such that $H = V_1 \dotplus V_2 = V_1^\perp \dotplus V_2$, that is, V_1 and V_2 is in generic position (cf. [6]). Let P_i be projection of H onto V_i, $i = 1, 2$. Then $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2) = \mathrm{Ran}(I - P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2)$. In this case, Halmos gave very useful matrix representations of P_1 and P_2 in [6]. Following Halmos' work, Sunder investigated in [14] the n–tuple closed subspaces $(V_1, \cdots, V_n)$ in H which satisfying the condition $H = V_1 \dotplus \cdots \dotplus V_n$. If let P_i be the projection of H onto V_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, then the condition $H = V_1 \dotplus \cdots \dotplus V_n$ is equivalent to $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_n)$.

Now the question yields: when does the relation $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_n)$ hold for an n–tuple of projections $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$? When $n = 2$, Buckholdtz proved in [3] that $\mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2) = H$ iff $P_1 - P_2$ is invertible in $B(H)$ iff $I - P_1P_2$ is invertible in $B(H)$ and iff $P_1 + P_2 - P_1P_2$ is invertible in $B(H)$. More information about two projections can be found in [2]. Koliha and Rakočević generalized Buckholdtz's

---

[*] E-mail: swhu@math.ecnu.edu.cn
[†] E-mail: yfxue@math.ecnu.edu.cn

work to the set of C^*–algebras and rings. They gave some equivalent conditions for decomposition $\mathfrak{R} = P\mathfrak{R} \dotplus Q\mathfrak{R}$ or $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}P \dotplus \mathfrak{R}Q$ in [9] and [10] for idempotent elements P and Q in a unital ring $\mathfrak{R}$. They also characterized the Fredhomness of the difference of projections on H in [11]. For $n \geq 3$, the question remains unknown so far. But there are some works concerning with this problem. For example, the estimation of the spectrum of the finite sum of projections on H is given in [1] and the C^*–algebra generated by certain projections is investigated in [13] and [15], etc..

Let $\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ denote the set of n–tuple ($n \geq 2$) of non–trivial projections in $\mathcal{A}$ and put

$$\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A}) = \{(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) \,|\, P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}\}.$$

It is worth to note that if $\mathcal{A} = B(H)$ and $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(B(H))$, then $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(B(H))$ if and only if $\mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_n) = H$ (see Theorem 1.2 below).

In this paper, we will investigate the set $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ for $n \geq 3$. The paper consists of four sections. In Section 1, we give some necessary and sufficient conditions that make $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ be in $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. In Section 2, using some equivalent conditions for $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ obtained in §1, we obtain an explicit expression of $P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}$ for $\{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \subset \{1, \cdots, n\}$. We discuss the perturbation problems for $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ in Section 3. We find an interesting result: if $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$ invertible in $\mathcal{A}$, then $\|P_iA^{-1}P_j\| < \big[(n-1)\|A^{-1}\|\|A\|^2\big]^{-1}$, $i \neq j$ implies $P_iA^{-1}P_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ in this section. We show in this section that for given $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, if $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies condition $\|P_iP_j\| < \epsilon$, then there exists an n–tuple of mutually orthogonal projections $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\|P_i - P_i'\| < 2(n-1)\epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, which improves a conventional estimate: $\|P_i - P_i'\| < (12)^{n-1}n!\epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ (cf. [8]). In the final section, we will study the topological properties and equivalent relations on $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

1 Equivalent conditions for complete n–tuples of projections in C^*–algebras

Let $GL(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. $U(\mathcal{A})$) denote the group of all invertible (resp. unitary) elements in $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathrm{M}_k(\mathcal{A})$ denote matrix algebra of all $k \times k$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we set $a\,\mathcal{A} = \{ax \,|\, x \in \mathcal{A}\} \subset \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 1.1. *An n–tuple of projections $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is called complete in $\mathcal{A}$, if $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *$(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ is complete in $\mathcal{A}$.*

(2) *$H_\psi = \mathrm{Ran}(\psi(P_1)) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(\psi(P_n))$ for any faithful representation (ψ, H_ψ) of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\psi(1) = I$.*

(3) *$H_\psi = \mathrm{Ran}(\psi(P_1)) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(\psi(P_n))$ for some faithful representation (ψ, H_ψ) of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\psi(1) = I$.*

(4) *$\sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j + \lambda P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ and $\forall\, \lambda \in [1-n, 0)$.*

(5) *$\lambda\big(\sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j\big) + P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ for $1 \le i \le n$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$.*

(6) *$A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_i A^{-1} P_i = P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.*

(7) *$A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_i A^{-1} P_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$.*

(8) *there is an n-tuple of idempotent operators $(E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $E_i P_i = E_i$, $P_i E_i = P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $E_i E_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1$.*

In order to show Theorem 1.2, we need following lemmas.

Lemma 1.3. *Let B, $C \in \mathcal{A}_+\backslash\{0\}$ and suppose that $\lambda B + C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. Then there is a non–trivial orthogonal projection $P \in \mathcal{A}$ such that*

$$B = (B+C)^{1/2} P (B+C)^{1/2}, \quad C = (B+C)^{1/2}(1-P)(B+C)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Put $D = B + C$ and $D_\lambda = \lambda B + C$, $\forall\, \lambda \in R\backslash\{0\}$. Then $D \geq 0$, D and D_λ are all invertible in $\mathcal{A}$, $\forall\, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$.

Put $B_1 = D^{-1/2} B D^{-1/2}$, $C_1 = D^{-1/2} C D^{-1/2}$. Then $B_1 + C_1 = 1$ and

$$D^{-1/2} D_\lambda D^{-1/2} = \lambda B_1 + C_1 = \lambda + (1-\lambda) C_1 = (1-\lambda)(\lambda(1-\lambda)^{-1} + C_1)$$

is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0, 1\}$. Since $\lambda \mapsto \dfrac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ is a homeomorphism from $\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0, 1\}$ onto $\mathbb{R}\backslash\{-1, 0\}$, it follows that $\sigma(C_1) \subset \{0, 1\}$. Note that B_1 and C_1 are all non–zero. So $\sigma(C_1) = \{0, 1\} = \sigma(B_1)$ and hence $P = B_1$ is a non–zero projection in $\mathcal{A}$ and $B = D^{1/2} P D^{1/2}$, $C = D^{1/2}(1-P) D^{1/2}$. □

Lemma 1.4. *Let B, $C \in \mathcal{A}_+\backslash\{0\}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *for any non–zero real number λ, $\lambda B + C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$.*

(2) *$B + C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ and $B(B+C)^{-1} B = B$.*

(3) *$B + C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ and $B(B+C)^{-1} C = 0$.*

(4) *$B + C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ and for any B', $C' \in \mathcal{A}_+$ with $B' \leq B$ and $C' \leq C$, $B'(B+C)^{-1} C' = 0$.*

Proof. (1)⇒(2) By Lemma 1.3, there is a non–zero projection P in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $B = D^{1/2}PD^{1/2}$, $C = D^{1/2}(1-P)D^{1/2}$, where $D = B + C \in GL(\mathcal{A})$. So

$$B(B+C)^{-1}B = D^{1/2}PD^{1/2}D^{-1}D^{1/2}PD^{1/2} = B.$$

The assertion (2) ⇔ (3) follows from

$$B(B+C)^{-1}B = B(B+C)^{-1}(B+C-C) = B - B(B+C)^{-1}C.$$

(3) ⇒ (4) For any C' with $0 \le C' \le C$,

$$0 \le B(B+C)^{-1}C'(B+C)^{-1}B \le B(B+C)^{-1}C(B+C)^{-1}B = 0,$$

we have $B(B+C)^{-1}C' = B(B+C)^{-1}C'^{1/2}C'^{1/2} = 0$. This implies $C'(B+C)^{-1}B = 0$. In the same way, we get that for any B' with $0 \le B' \le B$, $C'(B+C)^{-1}B' = 0$.

(4)⇒(3) is obvious.

(2)⇒(1) Set $X = (B+C)^{-1/2}B$ and $Y = (B+C)^{-1/2}C$. Then $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X^*X = B$, $X + Y = (B+C)^{1/2}$. Thus, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} X + \lambda Y &= (B+C)^{-1/2}(B+\lambda C) \\ (X+\lambda Y)^*(X+\lambda Y) &= ((1-\lambda)X + \lambda(B+C)^{1/2})^*((1-\lambda)X + \lambda(B+C)^{1/2}) \\ &= (1-\lambda)^2B + 2\lambda(1-\lambda)B + \lambda^2(B+C) \\ &= B + \lambda^2 C \end{aligned}$$

and consequently, $(X+\lambda Y)^*(X+\lambda Y) \ge B + C$ if $|\lambda| > 1$ and $(X+\lambda Y)^*(X+\lambda Y) \ge \lambda^2(B+C)$ when $|\lambda| < 1$. This indicates that $(X+\lambda Y)^*(X+\lambda Y)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. Noting that $B + C \ge \|(B+C)^{-1}\|^{-1} \cdot 1$, we have, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (B+\lambda C)^2 &= (X+\lambda Y)^*(B+C)(X+\lambda Y) \\ &\ge \|(B+C)^{-1}\|^{-1}(X+\lambda Y)^*(X+\lambda Y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $B + \lambda C$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$, $\forall\, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. □

Now we begin to prove Theorem 1.2.

(1)⇒(6) Statement (1) implies that there are $b_1, \cdots, b_n \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $1 = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i b_i$. Put $\hat{I} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $X = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & \cdots & P_n \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $Y = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_n & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Then

$$\hat{I} = XY = XYY^*X^* \le \|Y\|^2 XX^* = \|Y\|^2 \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and so that $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, from $\mathcal{A} = P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A}$ and

$$P_i = P_1A^{-1}P_i + \cdots + P_iA^{-1}P_i + \cdots + P_nA^{-1}P_i = \underbrace{0 + \cdots + 0}_{i-1} + P_i + \underbrace{0 + \cdots + 0}_{n-i},$$

$i = 1, \cdots, n$, we get that $P_i = P_iA^{-1}P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(2)⇒(3) is obvious.

(3)⇒(4) Set $Q_i = \psi(P_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. From $H_\psi = \mathrm{Ran}(Q_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(Q_n)$, we obtain idempotent operators $F_1, \cdots, F_n$ in $B(H_\psi)$ such that $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} F_i = I$, $F_iF_j = 0$, $i \neq j$ and $F_iH_\psi = Q_iH_\psi$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. So $F_iQ_i = Q_i$, $Q_iF_i = F_i$ and $F_jQ_i = 0$, $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Using these relations, it is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i Q_i\big)\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{-1} F_i^* F_i\big) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_i = I, \\ \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{-1} F_i^* F_i\big)\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i Q_i\big) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_i^* = I, \end{aligned}$$

for any non–zero complex number λ_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Particularly, for any $\lambda \in [1-n, 0)$,

$$\big(\lambda\big(\sum_{j\neq i} Q_j\big) + Q_i\big)^{-1} = \lambda^{-1} \sum_{j\neq i} F_j^* F_j + F_i^* F_i$$

in $B(H_\psi)$. Thus, $\lambda\big(\sum\limits_{j\neq i} Q_j\big) + Q_i$ is invertible $\psi(\mathcal{A})$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ by [17, Corollary 1.5.8] and so that $\lambda\big(\sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j\big) + P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ since ψ is faithful and $\psi(1) = I$.

(4)⇒(5) Put $A_i(\lambda) = \sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j + \lambda P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (A_i(\lambda))^2 &\leq 2\big(\sum_{j\neq i} P_j\big)^2 + 2\lambda^2 P_i \leq 2(n-1)\sum_{j\neq i} P_j + 2\lambda^2 P_i \\ &\leq 2\max\{n-1, \lambda^2\}(P_1 + \cdots + P_n). \end{aligned}$$

So $A_i(\lambda)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$, $\forall\, \lambda \in [1-n, 0)$ means that $A = P_1 + \cdots + P_n$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$. Consequently, $A_i(\lambda)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ when $\lambda > 0$, $\forall\, 1 \leq i \leq n$.

Now we show that $A_i(\lambda)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $\lambda < 1 - n$. Put

$$A_{1i} = P_iAP_i,\ A_{2i} = P_iA(1-P_i),\ A_{4i} = (1-P_i)A(1-P_i),\ i = 1, \cdots, n.$$

Express $A_i(\lambda)$ as the form $A_i(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1i} + (\lambda-1)P_i & A_{2i} \\ A_{2i}^* & A_{4i} \end{bmatrix}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Noting that A_{4i} is invertible in $(1-P_i)\mathcal{A}(1-P_i)$ ($A \geq \|A^{-1}\|^{-1} \cdot 1$, $A_{4i} \geq \|A^{-1}\|^{-1}(1-P_i)$) and

$$A_i(\lambda) \begin{bmatrix} P_i & 0 \\ -A_{4i}^{-1}A_{2i}^* & 1-P_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1i} - A_{2i}A_{4i}^{-1}A_{2i}^* + (\lambda-1)P_i & A_{2i} \\ 0 & A_{4i} \end{bmatrix},$$

we get that $A_i(\lambda)$ is invertible iff $A_{1i} - A_{2i}A_{4i}^{-1}A_{2i}^* + (\lambda - 1)P_i$ is invertible in $P_i\mathcal{A}P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Since $A_{1i} \leq nP_i$, it follows that

$$-A_{1i} + A_{2i}A_{4i}^{-1}A_{2i}^* - (\lambda - 1)P_i \geq (1 - n - \lambda)P_i + A_{2i}A_{4i}^{-1}A_{2i}^* \geq (1 - n - \lambda)P_i$$

when $\lambda < 1 - n$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Therefore, $A_i(\lambda)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ for $\lambda < 1 - n$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Applying Lemma 1.4 to $\sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j$ and P_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, we can get the implications (5)⇒(6) and (6)⇒ (7) easily.

(7)⇒(8) Set $E_i = P_iA^{-1}$, $i = 1 \cdots, n$. Then E_i is an idempotent elements in $\mathcal{A}$ and $E_iE_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. It is obvious that $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1$ and $P_iE_i = E_i$, $E_iP_i = P_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(8)⇒(1) Let $E_1, \cdots, E_n$ be idempotent elements in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $E_iE_j = \delta_{ij}E_i$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1$ and $E_iP_i = P_i$, $P_iE_i = E_i$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $E_i\mathcal{A} = P_i\mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $\mathcal{A} = E_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots E_n\mathcal{A} = P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A}$.

(8)⇒(2) Let $E_1, \cdots, E_n$ be idempotent elements in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $E_iE_j = \delta_{ij}E_i$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1$ and $E_iP_i = P_i$, $P_iE_i = E_i$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. Let (ψ, H_ψ) be any faithful representation of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\psi(1) = I$. Put $E_i' = \psi(E_i)$ and $Q_i = \psi(P_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $E_i'E_j' = \delta_{ij}E_i'$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} E_i' = I$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(E_i') = \mathrm{Ran}(Q_i)$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. Consequently, $H_\psi = \mathrm{Ran}(Q_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(Q_n)$. □

Remark 1.5. (1) Statement (3) in Theorem 1.2 can not be replaced by "for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, $P_i - \sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j$ is invertible".

For example, let $H^{(4)} = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{4} H$ and put $\mathcal{A} = B(H^{(4)})$,

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I & & & \\ & I & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} I & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & I & \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} I & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & 0 & \\ & & & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $P_i - \sum\limits_{j\neq i} P_j$ is invertible, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, but $P_2 + P_3 - 2P_1$ is not invertible, that is, (P_1, P_2, P_3) is not complete in $\mathcal{A}$.

(2) According to the proof of (3)⇒(4) of Theorem 1.2, we see that for $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$, if $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$, then $\sum\limits_{i\neq j} P_i - \lambda P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})$, $\forall\, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\lambda > n - 1$.

Corollary 1.6 ([3, Theorem 1]). *Let P_1, P_2 be non–trivial projections in $B(H)$. Then $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2)$ iff $P_1 - P_2$ is invertible in $B(H)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2)$ implies that $P_1 - P_2 \in GL(B(H))$.

Conversely, if $P_1 - P_2 \in GL(B(H))$, then from $2(P_1 + P_2) \geq (P_1 - P_2)^2$, we get that $P_1 + P_2 \in GL(B(H))$ and so that $P_1 - \lambda P_2, P_2 - \lambda P_1 \in GL(B(H))$, $\forall\, \lambda > 1$ by Remark 1.5 (2). Thus, for any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, $P_1 - \lambda P_2$ and $P_2 - \lambda P_1$ are all invertible in $B(H)$. Consequently, $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2)$ by Theorem 1.2. ☐

2 Some representations concerning the complete n–tuple of projections

We first statement two lemmas which are frequently used in this section and the later sections.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $B \in \mathcal{A}_+$ such that $0 \in \sigma(B)$ is an isolated point. Then there is a unique element $B^\dagger \in \mathcal{A}_+$ such that*

$$BB^\dagger B = B,\ B^\dagger B B^\dagger = B^\dagger,\ BB^\dagger = B^\dagger B.$$

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 3.5.8, Proposition 3.5.3 and Lemma 3.5.1 of [17]. ☐

Remark 2.2. The element $B^\dagger$ in Lemma 2.1 is called the Moore–Penrose inverse of B. When $0 \notin \sigma(B)$, $B^\dagger \triangleq B^{-1}$. The detailed information can be found in [17].

The following lemma comes from [17, Lemma 3.5.5] and [4, Lemma 1]:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $P \in \mathcal{A}$ be an idempotent element. Then*

(1) $P + P^* - 1 \in GL(\mathcal{A})$.

(2) $R = P(P + P^* - 1)^{-1}$ *is a projection in* $\mathcal{A}$ *satisfying* $PR = R$ *and* $RP = P$.

Moreover, if $R' \in \mathcal{A}$ is a projection such that $PR' = R'$ and $R'P = P$, then $R' = R$.

Let $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ and put $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$. By Theorem 1.2, $A \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $E_i = P_i A^{-1}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ are idempotent elements satisfying conditions

$$E_i E_j = 0,\ i \neq j,\ E_i P_i = P_i,\ P_i E_i = E_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n,\ \text{and}\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_i = 1.$$

By Lemma 2.3, $P_i = E_i(E_i^* + E_i - 1)^{-1}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. So the C^*–algebra $C^*(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ generated by $P_1, \cdots, P_n$ is equal to the C^*–algebra $C^*(E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ generated by $E_1, \cdots, E_n$.

Put $Q_i = A^{-1/2} P_i A^{-1/2}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $Q_i Q_j = \delta_{ij} Q_i$ by Theorem 1.2, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} Q_i = 1$. Thus,

$$P_i = A^{1/2} Q_i A^{1/2} \text{ and } E_i = P_i A^{-1} = A^{1/2} Q_i A^{-1/2},\ i = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{2.1}$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *with* $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$. *Then for any* $\lambda_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i P_i\big)^{-1} = A^{-1}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{-1} P_i\big) A^{-1}$.

Proof. Keeping the symbols as above. We have $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i P_i = A^{1/2}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i Q_i\big) A^{1/2}$. Thus,

$$\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i P_i\big)^{-1} = A^{-1/2}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{-1} Q_i\big) A^{-1/2} = A^{-1}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i^{-1} P_i\big) A^{-1}. \qquad \square$$

Now for $i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k$, put $A_0 = \sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}$ and $Q_0 = \sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}$. Then $A_0, Q_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and Q_0 is a projection. From (2.1), $A_0 = A^{1/2} Q_0 A^{1/2}$. Thus, $\sigma(A_0)\backslash\{0\} = \sigma(Q_0 A Q_0)\backslash\{0\}$ (cf. [17, Proposition 1.4.14]). Since $Q_0 A Q_0$ is invertible in $Q_0 \mathcal{A} Q_0$, it follows that $0 \in \sigma(Q_0 A Q_0)$ is an isolated point and so that $0 \in \sigma(A_0)$ is also an isolated point. So we can define $P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}$ to be the projection $A_0^\dagger A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ by Lemma 2.1. This definition is reasonable:

if $P \in \mathcal{A}$ is a projection such that $P \geq P_{i_r}$, $r = 1, \cdots, k$, then $PA_0 = A_0$ and hence $PA_0 A_0^\dagger = A_0 A_0^\dagger$, i.e., $P \geq P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}$; Since $A_0 \geq P_{i_r}$, we have

$$0 = (1 - A_0^\dagger A_0) A_0 (1 - A_0^\dagger A_0) \geq (1 - A_0^\dagger A_0) P_{i_r} (1 - A_0^\dagger A_0)$$

and consequently, $P_{i_r}(1 - A_0^\dagger A_0) = 0$, that is, $P_{i_r} \leq P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}$, $i = 1, \cdots, k$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *with* $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$. *Let* $i_1, \cdots, i_k$ *be as above and* $\{j_1, \cdots, j_l\} = \{1, \cdots, n\}\backslash\{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$ *with* $j_1 < \cdots < j_l$. *Then*

$$P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k} = A^{1/2}\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) A \big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\big]^{-1} A^{1/2} \tag{2.2}$$

$$= \big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)^2 + \sum_{t=1}^{l} P_{j_t}\big]^{-1}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Using the symbols P_i, Q_i, E_i as above. According to (2.1),

$$\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r} = A^{1/2}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) A^{1/2}, \ \sum_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r} = A^{1/2}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) A^{-1/2}.$$

Thus $\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r}\big)\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big) = \sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}$ and $\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r} = \big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big) A^{-1}$. Then we have

$$\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r}\big) P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k} = P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}, \quad P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r}\big) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r},$$

according to the definition of $P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}$.

Since $\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r}$ is an idempotent element in $\mathcal{A}$, it follows from Lemma 2.3 that

$$P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k} = \big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} E_{i_r}\big)\big[\sum_{r=1}^{k}(E_{i_r}^{*} + E_{i_r}) - 1\big]^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{2.4}$$

Noting that $\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) \in GL\big(\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\mathcal{A}\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\big)$; $\big(\sum\limits_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)A\big(\sum\limits_{t=1}^{k} Q_{j_t}\big)$ is invertible in $\big(\sum\limits_{t=1}^{k} Q_{j_t}\big)\mathcal{A}\big(\sum\limits_{t=1}^{k} Q_{j_t}\big)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=1}^{k}(E_{i_r}^{*} + E_{i_r}) - 1 &= A^{-1/2}\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A + A\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) - A\big]A^{-1/2}\\ &= A^{-1/2}\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big) - \big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)A\big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)\big]A^{-1/2},\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\big[\sum_{r=1}^{k}(E_{i_r}^{*} + E_{i_r}) - 1\big]^{-1}\\ &\qquad = A^{1/2}\big[\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\big]^{-1} - \big[\big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)A\big(\sum_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)\big]^{-1}\big]A^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.4), we can get (2.2).

Note that $\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r} = A^{1/2}\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A^{1/2}$, $\sum\limits_{t=1}^{l} P_{j_t} = A^{1/2}\big(\sum\limits_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)A^{1/2}$ and $\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)^{2} = A^{1/2}\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A\big(\sum\limits_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A^{1/2}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)^{2} + \sum_{t=1}^{l} P_{j_t}\big]^{-1}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} P_{i_r}\big)\\ &= A^{1/2}\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\big(\big[\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)\big]^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^{l} Q_{j_t}\big)\big(\sum_{r=1}^{k} Q_{i_r}\big)A^{1/2}\\ &= P_{i_1} \vee \cdots \vee P_{i_k}\end{aligned}$$

by (2.2). $\square$

3 Perturbations of a complete n–tuple of projections

Recall that for any non–zero operator $C \in B(H)$, the reduced minimum modulus $\gamma(C)$ is given by $\gamma(C) = \{\|Cx\| \,|\, x \in (\mathrm{Ker}(C))^{\perp},\ \|x\| = 1\}$ (cf. [17, Remark 1.2.10]). We list some properties of the reduced minimum modulus as our lemma as follows.

Lemma 3.1 (cf. [17])**.** *Let C be in $B(H)\backslash\{0\}$, Then*

(1) $\|Cx\| \geq \gamma(C)\|x\|,\ \forall\, x \in (\mathrm{Ker}(C))^{\perp}$.

(2) $\gamma(C) = \inf\{\lambda \,|\, \lambda \in \sigma(|C|)\backslash\{0\}\}$, *where* $|C| = (C^*C)^{1/2}$.

(3) $\gamma(C) > 0$ *iff* $\mathrm{Ran}(C)$ *is closed iff* 0 *is an isolated point of* $\sigma(|C|)$ *if* $0 \in \sigma(|C|)$.

(4) $\gamma(C) = \|C^{-1}\|^{-1}$ *when* C *is invertible.*

(5) $\gamma(C) \geq \|B\|^{-1}$ *when* $CBC = C$ *for* $B \in B(H)\backslash\{0\}$.

For $a \in \mathcal{A}_+$, put $\beta(a) = \inf\{\lambda|\, \lambda \in \sigma(a)\backslash\{0\}\}$. Combining Lemma 3.1 with the faithful representation of $\mathcal{A}$, we can obtain

Corollary 3.2. *Let* $a \in \mathcal{A}_+$. *Then*

(1) $\beta(a) > 0$ *if and only if* $0 \in \sigma(a)$ *is isolated when* $a \notin GL(\mathcal{A})$.

(2) $\beta(c) \geq \|c\|^{-1}$ *when* $aca = a$ *for some* $c \in \mathcal{A}_+\backslash\{0\}$.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a C^*–subalgebra of $B(H)$ with the unit I. Let $(T_1, \cdots, T_n)$ be an n–tuple of positive operators in $\mathcal{E}$ with $\mathrm{Ran}(T_i)$ closed, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Put $H_0 = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Ran}(T_i) \subset \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} H \triangleq \hat{H}$ and $H_1 = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Ker}(T_i) \subset \hat{H}$. Since $H = \mathrm{Ran}(T_i) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(T_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, it follows that $H_0 \oplus H_1 = \hat{H}$. Put $T_{ij} = T_iT_j\big|_{\mathrm{Ran}(T_j)}$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ and set

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} T_1^2 & T_1T_2 & \cdots & T_1T_n \\ T_2T_1 & T_2^2 & \cdots & T_2T_n \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ T_nT_1 & T_2T_2 & \cdots & T_n^2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{M}_n(\mathcal{E}),\ \hat{T} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} & \cdots & T_{1n} \\ T_{21} & T_{22} & \cdots & T_{2n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ T_{n1} & T_{n2} & \cdots & T_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \in B(H_0), \tag{3.1}$$

Clearly, $H_1 \subset \mathrm{Ker}(T)$ and it is easy to check that $\mathrm{Ker}(T) = H_1$ when $\mathrm{Ker}(\hat{T}) = \{0\}$. Thus, in this case, T can be expressed as $T = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{T} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ with respect to the orthogonal decomposition $\hat{H} = H_0 \oplus H_1$ and consequently, $\sigma(T) = \sigma(\hat{T}) \cup \{0\}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $(T_1, \cdots, T_n)$ *be an* n*–tuple of positive operators in* $\mathcal{E}$ *with* $\mathrm{Ran}(T_i)$ *closed,* $i = 1, \cdots, n$. *Let* $H_0, H_1, \hat{H}$ *be as above and* T, $\hat{T}$ *be given in (3.1). Suppose that* $\hat{T}$ *is invertible in* $B(H_0)$. *Then*

(1) $\sigma(\hat{T}) = \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)\backslash\{0\}$.

(2) 0 *is an isolated point in* $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$ *if* $0 \in \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$.

(3) $\{T_1a_1, \cdots, T_na_n\}$ *is linearly independent for any* $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in \mathcal{E}$ *with* $T_ia_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Proof. (1) Put $Z = \begin{bmatrix} T_1 & \cdots & T_n \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{M}_n(\mathcal{E})$. Then $ZZ^* = \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2 & & \\ & 0 & \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $Z^*Z = T$. Thus, $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)\backslash\{0\} = \sigma(T)\backslash\{0\} = \sigma(\hat{T})$.

(2) According to (1), 0 is an isolated point of $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)$ if $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2$ is not invertible in $\mathcal{E}$. So by Lemma 2.1, there is $G \in \mathcal{E}_+$ such that

$$\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)G\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2,\ G\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)G = G,\ \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)G = G\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big).$$

Put $P_0 = I - \big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)G \in \mathcal{E}$. Then P_0 is a projection with $\mathrm{Ran}(P_0) = \mathrm{Ker}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)$. Noting that $\mathrm{Ker}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big) = \mathrm{Ker}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big) = \bigcap\limits_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Ker}(T_i)$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2 \in GL((I-P_0)\mathcal{E}(I-P_0))$ with the inverse G and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2 \leq (\max\limits_{1\leq i\leq n} \|T_i\|) \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i$, we get that $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i$ is invertible in $(I - P_0)\mathcal{E}(I - P_0)$. Thus, 0 is an isolated point of $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$ when $0 \in \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$.

(3) By Lemma 3.1 (3) and Lemma 2.1, there is $T_i^\dagger \in \mathcal{E}_+$ such that $T_iT_i^\dagger T_i = T_i$, $T_i^\dagger T_i T_i^\dagger = T_i^\dagger$, $T_i^\dagger T_i = T_i T_i^\dagger$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Thus, $\mathrm{Ran}(T_i) = \mathrm{Ran}(T_iT_i^\dagger)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Let $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in \mathcal{E}$ with $T_ia_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ such that $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i T_i a_i = 0$ for some $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$. For any $\xi \in H$, put $x = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i T_i T_i^\dagger a_i \xi \in H_0$. Then $\hat{T}x = 0$ and $x = 0$ since $\hat{T}$ is invertible. Thus, $\lambda_i T_i T_i^\dagger a_i \xi = 0$, $\forall\, \xi \in H$ and hence $\lambda_i = 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. $\square$

The following result duo to Levy and Dedplanques is very useful in Matrix Theory:

Lemma 3.4 (cf. [7]). *Suppose complex $n \times n$ self–adjoint matrix $C = [c_{ij}]_{n\times n}$ is strictly diagonally dominant, that is, $\sum\limits_{j\neq i} |c_{ij}| < c_{ii}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then C is invertible and positive.*

Proposition 3.5. *Let $T_1, \cdots, T_n \in \mathcal{A}_+$. Assume that*

(1) $\gamma = \min\{\beta(T_1), \cdots, \beta(T_n)\} > 0$ *and*

(2) *there exists* $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$ *such that* $\eta = \max\{\|T_iT_j\| \,|\, i \neq j, i, j = 1, \cdots, n\} < (n-1)^{-1}\rho^2$.

Then for any $\delta \in [\eta, (n-1)^{-1}\rho^2)$, we have

(1) $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)\backslash\{0\} \subset [\rho^2 - (n-1)\delta, \rho^2 + (n-1)\delta]$.

(2) 0 *is an isolated point of* $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$ *if* $0 \in \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)$.

(3) $\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)\mathcal{A} = T_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus T_n\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. (1) Let (ψ, H_ψ) be a faithful representation of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\psi(1) = I$. We may assume that $H = H_\psi$ and $\mathcal{E} = \psi(\mathcal{A})$. Put $S_i = \psi(T_i)$, $S_{ij} = S_iS_j\big|_{\mathrm{Ran}(S_j)}$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $\max\{\|S_iS_j\| \,|\, 1 \le i \ne j \le n\} = \eta$ and $\gamma(S_i) = \beta(T_i)$ by Lemma 3.1, $1 \le i \le n$. Set $H_0 = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Ran}(S_i)$ and

$$\hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} & \cdots & S_{1n} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} & \cdots & S_{2n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ S_{n1} & S_{n2} & \cdots & S_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \in B(H_0), \quad S_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \rho^2-\lambda & -\|S_{12}\| & \cdots & -\|S_{1n}\| \\ -\|S_{21}\| & \rho^2-\lambda & \cdots & -\|S_{2n}\| \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ -\|S_{n1}\| & -\|S_{n2}\| & \cdots & \rho^2-\lambda \end{bmatrix},$$

Then for any $\lambda < \rho^2 - (n-1)\delta$, we have $\sum\limits_{j\ne i} \|S_{ij}\| \le (n-1)\eta < \rho^2 - \lambda$. It follows from Lemma 3.4 that S_0 is positive and invertible. Therefore the quadratic form

$$f(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\rho^2 - \lambda)x_i^2 - 2\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \|S_{ij}\|x_ix_j$$

is positive definite and hence there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$f(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \ge \alpha(x_1^2 + \cdots + x_n^2).$$

So for any $\xi = \bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i \in H_0$, $\|S_i\xi_i\| \ge \gamma(S_i)\|\xi_i\| \ge \rho\|\xi_i\|$, $\xi_i \in \mathrm{Ran}(S_i) = (\mathrm{Ker}(S_i))^\perp$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, by Lemma 3.1 and

$$\begin{aligned} <(\hat{S} - \lambda I)\xi, \xi> &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|S_i\xi_i\|^2 - \sum_{i}^{n} \lambda\|\xi_i\|^2 + \sum_{1\le i<j\le n} (<S_{ij}\xi_j, \xi_i> + <S_{ij}^*\xi_i, \xi_j>) \\ &\ge \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\rho^2 - \lambda)\|\xi_i\|^2 - 2\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \|S_{ij}\|\|\xi_i\|\|\xi_j\| \\ &= f(\|\xi_1\|, \cdots, \|\xi_k\|) \ge \alpha\sum_{i=1}^{k} \|\xi_i\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{S} - \lambda I$ is invertible.

Similarly, for any $\lambda > \rho^2 + (n-1)\delta$, we can obtain that $\lambda I - \hat{S}$ is invertible. So $\sigma(\hat{S}) \subset [\rho^2 - (n-1)\delta, \rho^2 + (n-1)\delta] \subset (0, \rho^2 + (n-1)\delta]$ and consequently, $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i^2\big)\backslash\{0\} = \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} S_i^2\big)\backslash\{0\} \subset [\rho^2 - (n-1)\delta, \rho^2 + (n-1)\delta]$ by Lemma 3.3.

(2) Since $\sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big) = \sigma\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} S_i\big)$, the assertion follows from Lemma 3.3 (2).

(3) By (2) and Lemma 2.1, $\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)^{\dagger} \in \mathcal{A}$ exists. Set $E = \big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)^{\dagger}$. Obviously, $E\mathcal{A} = \big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)\mathcal{A} \subset T_1\mathcal{A} + \cdots + T_n\mathcal{A}$ for $E\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i$.

From $T_i \leq \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i$, we get that $(1-E)T_i(1-E) \leq (1-E)\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)(1-E) = 0$, i.e., $T_i = ET_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. So $T_i\mathcal{A} \subset E\mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and hence

$$T_1\mathcal{A} + \cdots + T_n\mathcal{A} \subset E\mathcal{A} = \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)\mathcal{A} \subset T_1\mathcal{A} + \cdots + T_n\mathcal{A}.$$

Since for any $a_1, \cdots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}$ with $T_i a_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\{S_1\psi(a_i), \cdots, S_n\psi(a_n)\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{E}$, we have $\{T_1 a_1, \cdots, T_n a_n\}$ is linearly independent in $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, $\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i\big)\mathcal{A} = E\mathcal{A} = T_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus T_n\mathcal{A}$. $\square$

Let P_1, P_2 be projections on H. Buckholtz shows in [3] that $\mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_2) = H$ iff $\|P_1 + P_2 - I\| < 1$. For $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$, we have

Corollary 3.6. *Let* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *with* $\big\|\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i - 1\big\| < (n-1)^{-2}$. *Then* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ *is complete in* $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. For any $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_iP_j\|^2 = \|P_iP_jP_i\| &\leq \big\|P_i\big(\sum_{k\neq i} P_k\big)P_i\big\| \\ &= \big\|P_i\big(\sum_{k=1}^{n} P_k - 1\big)P_i\big\| \leq \big\|\sum_{k=1}^{n} P_k - 1\big\| < \frac{1}{(n-1)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|P_iP_j\| < (n-1)^{-1}$. Noting that

$$\rho = \min\{\beta(P_1), \cdots, \beta(P_n)\} = 1, \ \eta = \max\{\|P_iP_j\| \,|\, 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} < \frac{1}{n-1},$$

we have $\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i\big)\mathcal{A} = P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A}$ by Proposition 3.5.

From $\big\|\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i - 1\big\| < (n-1)^{-2}$, we have $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ and so that $\mathcal{A} = P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A}$. Thus, $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ is complete in $\mathcal{A}$. $\square$

Combing Corollary 3.6 with Theorem 1.2 (3), we have

Corollary 3.7. *Let* $P_1, \cdots, P_n$ *be non–trivial projections in* $B(H)$ *with* $\big\|\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i - I\big\| < (n-1)^{-2}$. *Then* $H = \mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_n)$.

Let $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$. A well–known statement says: "for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $\|P_iP_j\| < \delta$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, then there are mutually orthogonal projections $P'_1, \cdots, P'_n \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\|P_i - P'_i\| < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$". It may be the first time appeared in Glimm's paper [5]. By using the induction on n, he gave its proof. But how δ depends on ϵ is not given. Lemma 2.5.6 of [8] states this statement and the author gives a slightly different proof. We can find from the proof of [8, Lemma 2.5.6] that the relation between δ and ϵ is $\delta \leq \frac{\epsilon}{(12)^{(n-1)}n!}$.

The next corollary will give a new proof of this statement with the relation $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2(n-1)}$ for $\epsilon \in (0,1)$.

Corollary 3.8. *Let* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$*. Given* $\epsilon \in (0,1)$*. If* $P_1, \cdots, P_n$ *satisfy condition:* $\|P_iP_j\| < \delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2(n-1)}$, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$*, then there are mutually orthogonal projections* $P'_1, \cdots, P'_n \in \mathcal{A}$ *such that* $\|P_i - P'_i\| < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$*.*

Proof. Set $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$. Noting that $\gamma = \min\{\beta(P_1), \cdots, \beta(P_n)\} = 1$, $\|P_iP_j\| < \frac{1}{n-1}$, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and taking $\rho = 1$, we have $\sigma(A)\backslash\{0\} \subset [1-(n-1)\delta, 1+(n-1)\delta]$ by Proposition 3.5 (1). So the positive element $A^\dagger$ exists by Lemma 2.1. Set $P = A^\dagger A = AA^\dagger \in \mathcal{A}$. From $AA^\dagger A = A$ and $A^\dagger AA^\dagger = A^\dagger$, we get that $P_i \leq P$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $AP = PA = A$, $A^\dagger P = PA^\dagger = A^\dagger$. So $A \in GL(P\mathcal{A}P)$ with the inverse $A^\dagger \in P\mathcal{A}P$. Let $\sigma_{P\mathcal{A}P}(A^\dagger)$ stand for the spectrum of $A^\dagger$ in $P\mathcal{A}P$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{P\mathcal{A}P}(A^\dagger) &= \sigma(A^\dagger)\backslash\{0\} = \{\lambda^{-1} \,|\, \lambda \in \sigma(A)\backslash\{0\}\}\\ &\subset [(1+(n-1)\delta)^{-1}, (1-(n-1)\delta)^{-1}],\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Now by Proposition 3.5, $P\mathcal{A} = A\mathcal{A} = P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A}$. Thus, by using $P_i \leq P$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, we have $P\mathcal{A}P = P_1(P\mathcal{A}P) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n(P\mathcal{A}P)$ and then $P_iA^\dagger P_j = \delta_{ij}P_i$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ by Theorem 1.2. Put $P'_i = (A^\dagger)^{1/2}P_i(A^\dagger)^{1/2} \in \mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $P'_1, \cdots, P'_n$ are mutually orthogonal projections and moreover, for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|P'_i - P_i\| &\leq \|(A^\dagger)^{1/2}P_i(A^\dagger)^{1/2} - P_i(A^\dagger)^{1/2}\| + \|P_i(A^\dagger)^{1/2} - P_i\|\\ &\leq (\|(A^\dagger)^{1/2}\| + 1)\|(A^\dagger)^{1/2} - P\|.\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Note that $0 < (n-1)\delta < 1/2$. Applying Spectrum Mapping Theorem to (3.2), we get that $\|(A^\dagger)^{1/2}\|) \leq (1-(n-1)\delta)^{-1/2} < \sqrt{2}$ and

$$\|P - (A^\dagger)^{1/2}\| \leq (1-(n-1)\delta)^{-1/2} - 1 < \frac{2}{1+\sqrt{2}}(n-1)\delta.$$

Thus $\|P'_i - P_i\| < 2(n-1)\delta = \epsilon$ by (3.3). □

Applying Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 3.8 to an n–tuple of linear independent unit vectors, we have:

Corollary 3.9. *Let* $(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ *be an* n*–tuple of linear independent unit vectors in Hilbert space* H*.*

(1) *There is an invertible, positive operator* K *in* $B(H)$ *and an* n*–tuple of mutually orthogonal unit vectors* $(\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_n)$ *in* H *such that* $\gamma_i = K\alpha_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$*.*

(2) *Given* $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. *If* $| < \alpha_i, \alpha_j > | < \dfrac{\epsilon}{2(n-1)}$, $1 \le i < j \le n$, *then there exists an n–tuple of mutually orthogonal unit vectors* $(\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n)$ *in* H *such that* $\|\alpha_i - \beta_j\| < 2\epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

Proof. Set $H_1 = \mathrm{span}\{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n\}$ and $P_i\xi = < \xi, \alpha_i > \alpha_i$, $\forall\, \xi \in H_1$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(B(H_1))$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(P_1) \dotplus \cdots \dotplus \mathrm{Ran}(P_n) = H_1$.

By Theorem 1.2, $A_0 = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$ is invertible in $B(H_1)$ and $P_iA_0^{-1}P_j = \delta_{ij}P_i$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$. Put $K = A_0^{-1/2} + P_0$ and $\gamma_i = A_0^{-1/2}\alpha_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, where P_0 is the projection of H onto $H_1^{\perp}$. It is easy to check that K is invertible and positive in $B(H)$ with $\gamma_i = K\alpha_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $(\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_n)$ is an n–tuple of mutually orthogonal unit vectors. This proves (1).

(2) Note that $\|P_iP_j\| = | < \alpha_i, \alpha_j > | < \dfrac{\epsilon}{2(n-1)}$, $1 \le i < j \le n$. Thus, by Corollary 3.8, there are mutually orthogonal projections $P_1', \cdots, P_n' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|P_i - P_i'\| < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Put $\beta_i' = P_i'\alpha_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $\beta_1', \cdots, \beta_n'$ are mutually orthogonal and $\|\alpha_i - \beta_i'\| < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Set $\beta_i = \|\beta_i'\|^{-1}\beta_i'$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $< \beta_i, \beta_j > = \delta_{ij}\beta_i$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$ and

$$\|\alpha_i - \beta_i\| \le \|\alpha_i - \beta_i'\| + |1 - \|\beta_i'\|| < 2\epsilon,$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. ☐

Now we give a simple characterization of the completeness of a given n–tuple of projections in C^*–algebra $\mathcal{A}$ as follows.

Theorem 3.10. *Let* $P_1, \cdots, P_n$ *be projections in* $\mathcal{A}$. *Then* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ *is complete if and only if* $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$ *is invertible in* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $\|P_iA^{-1}P_j\| < \big[(n-1)\|A^{-1}\|\|A\|^2\big]^{-1}$, $\forall\, i \ne j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$.

Proof. If $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ is complete, then by Theorem 1.2, A is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ and $P_iA^{-1}P_j = 0$, $\forall\, i \ne j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$.

Now we prove the converse.

Put $T_i = A^{-1/2}P_iA^{-1/2}$, $1 \le i \le n$. Then $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} T_i = 1$. Since $T_i(A^{1/2}P_iA^{1/2})T_i = T_i$, we have $\beta(T_i) \ge \|A^{1/2}P_iA^{1/2}\|^{-1} \ge \|A\|^{-1}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ by Corollary 3.2. Put $\rho = \|A\|^{-1}$. Then

$$\|T_iT_j\| \le \|A^{-1}\|\|P_iA^{-1}P_j\| < \big[(n-1)\|A\|^2\big]^{-1} = \frac{\rho^2}{n-1},\ i \ne j,\ i, j = 1, \cdots, n.$$

Thus by Proposition 3.5 (3), $\mathcal{A} = T_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus T_n\mathcal{A}$. Note that $T_i\mathcal{A} = A^{-1/2}(P_i\mathcal{A})$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. So $P_1\mathcal{A} \dotplus \cdots \dotplus P_n\mathcal{A} = A^{1/2}\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$, i.e., $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. ☐

Corollary 3.11. *Let* $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *and let* $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$. *Assume that* $\|P_i - P_i'\| < \big[4n^2(n-1)\|A^{-1}\|^2(n\|A^{-1}\| + 1)\big]^{-1}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, *where* $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i$, *then* $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Set $B = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} P_i'$. Since $n\|A^{-1}\| \geq \|A\|\|A^{-1}\| \geq 1$, it follows that $\|A-B\| < \dfrac{1}{2\|A^{-1}\|}$. Thus B is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ with

$$\|B^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\|A^{-1}\|}{1-\|A^{-1}\|\|A-B\|} < 2\|A^{-1}\|,\ \|B^{-1}-A^{-1}\| < 2\|A^{-1}\|^2\|A-B\|.$$

Note that $P_iA^{-1}P_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_i'B^{-1}P_j'\| &\leq \|P_i'(B^{-1}-A^{-1})P_j'\| + \|(P_i'-P_i)A^{-1}P_j'\| + \|P_iA^{-1}(P_j-P_j')\| \\ &\leq 2\|A^{-1}\|^2\|A-B\| + \|A^{-1}\|\|P_i-P_i'\| + \|A^{-1}\|\|P_j-P_j'\| \\ &< \frac{1}{2n^2(n-1)\|A^{-1}\|} < \frac{1}{(n-1)\|B^{-1}\|\|B\|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

So $(P_1', \cdots, P_n')$ is complete in $\mathcal{A}$ by Theorem 3.10. $\square$

4 Some equivalent relations and topological properties on $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*–algebra with the unit 1 and let $GL_0(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. $U_0(\mathcal{A})$) be the connected component of 1 in $GL(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. in $U(\mathcal{A})$). Set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A}) &= \big\{(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i \in GL(\mathcal{A})\big\} \\ \mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A}) &= \big\{(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i = 1,\ P_iP_j = 0,\ i \neq j,\ i, j = 1, \cdots, n\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.1. *Let $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and $(P_1', \cdots, P_n')$ be in $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.*

1. *We say $(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ is equivalent to $(P_1', \cdots, P_n')$, denoted by $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim (P_1', \cdots, P_n')$, if there are $U_1, \cdots, U_n \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $P_i = U_i^*U_i$, $P_i' = U_iU_i^*$.*
2. *$(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and $(P_1', \cdots, P_n')$ are called to be unitarily equivalent, denoted by $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim_u (P_1', \cdots, P_n')$, if there is $U \in U(\mathcal{A})$ such that $UP_iU^* = P_i'$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.*
3. *$(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and $(P_1', \cdots, P_n')$ are called homotopically equivalent, denoted by $(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim_h (P_1', \cdots, P_n')$, if there exists a continuous mapping $F\colon [0,1] \to \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $F(0) = (P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and $F(1) = (P_1', \cdots, P_n')$.*

It is well–know that

$$(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim_h (P_1', \cdots, P_n') \Rightarrow (P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim (P_1', \cdots, P_n')$$

and if $U(\mathcal{A})$ is path–connected,

$$(P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim_u (P_1', \cdots, P_n') \Rightarrow (P_1, \cdots, P_n) \sim_h (P_1', \cdots, P_n').$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ *be in* $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *and* C *be a positive and invertible element in* $\mathcal{A}$ *with* $P_iC^2P_i=P_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. *Then* $(CP_1C,\cdots,CP_nC)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *and* $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_h(CP_1C,\cdots,CP_nC)$ *in* $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. From $(CP_iC)^2=CP_iC^2P_iC=CP_iC$, $1\le i\le n$, we have $(CP_1C,\cdots,CP_nC)\in\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$. $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ implies that $A=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}P_i\in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_iA^{-1}P_i=P_i$, $1\le i\le n$ by Theorem 1.2. So $(CP_iC)\Big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}(CP_iC)\Big)^{-1}(CP_iC)=CP_iA^{-1}P_iC$ and hence $(CP_1C,\cdots,CP_nC)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ by Theorem 1.2.

Put $A_i(t)=C^tP_iC^t$ and $B_i(t)=C^{-t}P_iC^{-t}$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Then $Q_i(t)\triangleq A_i(t)B_i(t)=C^tP_iC^{-t}$ is idempotent and $A_i(t)B_i(t)A_i(t)=A_i(t)$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Thus $A_i(t)\mathcal{A}=Q_i(t)\mathcal{A}$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$, $i=1,\cdots,n$.

By Lemma 2.3, $P_i(t)\triangleq Q_i(t)(Q_i(t)+(Q_i(t))^*-1)^{-1}$ is a projection in $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying $Q_i(t)P_i(t)=P_i(t)$ and $P_i(t)Q_i(t)=Q_i(t)$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Clearly, $A_i(t)\mathcal{A}=Q_i(t)\mathcal{A}=P_i(t)\mathcal{A}$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$ and $t\mapsto P_i(t)$ is a continuous mapping from $[0,1]$ into $\mathcal{A}$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Thus, from

$$(C^tP_1C^t)\mathcal{A}\dotplus\cdots\dotplus(C^tP_nC^t)\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A},\quad\forall\,t\in[0,1],$$

we get that $F(t)=(P_1(t),\cdots,P_n(t))\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $\forall\,t\in[0,1]$. Note that $F\colon[0,1]\to\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is continuous with $F(0)=(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$. Note that $A_i(1)=CP_iC$ is a projection with $A_i(1)Q_i(1)=CP_iCCP_iC^{-1}=Q_i(1)$ and $Q_i(1)A_i(1)=A_i(1)$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. So $P_i(1)=A_i(1)$, $i=1,\cdots,n$ and $F(1)=(CP_1C,\cdots,CP_nC)$. The assertion follows. ☐

For $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $A=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}P_i\in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $Q_i=A^{-1/2}P_iA^{-1/2}$ is a projection with $Q_iQ_j=0$, $i\neq j$, $i,j=1,\cdots,n$ (see Theorem 1.2), that is, $(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)\in\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Since $C=A^{-1/2}$ satisfies the condition given in Lemma 4.2, we have the following:

Corollary 4.3. *Let* $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *and let* $(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)$ *be as above. Then* $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_h(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)$ *in* $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ *and* $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. *Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim(P_1',\cdots,P_n')$.

(2) *there is* $D\in GL(\mathcal{A})$ *such that for* $1\le i\le n$, $P_iDD^*P_i=P_i$ *and* $P_i'=D^*P_iD$.

(3) *there is* $(S_1,\cdots,S_n)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ *such that*

$$(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_u(S_1,\cdots,S_n)\sim_h(P_1',\cdots,P_n').$$

Proof. The implication (3)⇒(1) is obvious. We now prove the implications (1)⇒(2) and (2)⇒(3) as follows.

(1)⇒ (2) Let $U_i \in \mathcal{A}$ be partial isometries such that $U_i^*U_i = P_i$, $U_iU_i^* = P_i'$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Put $A = \sum\limits_{i=1}^n P_i$, $A' = \sum\limits_{i=1}^n P_i'$ and $W = A^{-1/2}\big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^n P_iU_i^*P_i'\big)A'^{-1/2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W^*W &= A'^{-1/2}\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i'U_iP_i\big)A^{-1}\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_iU_i^*P_i'\big)A'^{-1/2} \\ &= A'^{-1/2}\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i'U_iP_iU_i^*P_i'\big)A'^{-1/2} = A'^{-1/2}\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i'\big)A'^{-1/2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $WW^* = 1$. Thus, $W \in U(\mathcal{A})$. Set $D = A^{-1/2}WA'^{1/2} \in GL(\mathcal{A})$. Then, for $1 \le i \le n$,

$$D^*P_iD = \big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i'U_iP_i\big)A^{-1}P_iA^{-1}\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_iU_i^*P_i'\big) = P_i'U_iP_iU_i^*P_i' = P_i'$$

and $P_iDD^*P_i = P_i$ follows from $(D^*P_iD)^2 = D^*P_iD$.

(2)⇒(3) Put $U = (DD^*)^{-1/2}D$. Then $U \in U(\mathcal{A})$. Set $C = U^*(DD^*)^{1/2}U$ and $S_i = U^*P_iU$, $1 \le i \le n$. Then $(S_1, \cdots, S_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $(S_1, \cdots, S_n) \sim_u (P_1, \cdots, P_n)$ and $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') = (CS_1C, \cdots, CS_nC)$.

Since $S_iC^2S_i = U^*P_iDD^*P_iU = S_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') \sim_h (S_1, \cdots, S_n)$ in $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. ☐

Proposition 4.5. *For $\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$, we have*

1. *$\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is open in $\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$.*
2. *$\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is a clopen subset of $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$.*
3. *$\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is a strong deformation retract of $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.*
4. *$\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is locally connected. Thus every connected component of $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is path–connected.*
5. *$(P_1, \cdots, P_n)$, $(P_1', \cdots, P_n') \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ are in the same connected component iff there is $D \in GL_0(\mathcal{A})$ such that $P_i = D^*P_i'D$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.*

Proof. (1) Since $h(P_1, \cdots, P_n) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^n P_i$ is a continuous mapping from $\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $\mathcal{A}$ and $GL(\mathcal{A})$ is open in $\mathcal{A}$, it follows that $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A}) = h^{-1}(GL(\mathcal{A}))$ is open in $\mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

(2) Define $F\colon \mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F(P_1, \cdots, P_n) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} (n-1)\big\|\sum_{i=1}^n P_i\big\|^2\big\|\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i\big)^{-1}\big\|\big\|P_i\big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i\big)^{-1}P_j\big\|.$$

Clearly, F is continuous on $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$. By means of Theorem 3.10, we get that $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A}) = F^{-1}((-1,1))$ is open in $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A}) = F^{-1}(\{0\})$ is closed in $\mathbf{PI}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

(3) Define the continuous mapping $r\colon \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$r(P_1,\cdots,P_n) = \big(A^{-1/2}P_1A^{-1/2},\cdots,A^{-1/2}P_nA^{-1/2}\big), \quad A = \sum_{i=1}^n P_i.$$

by Theorem 1.2. Clearly, $r(P_1,\cdots,P_n) = (P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ when $(P_1,\cdots,P_n) \in \mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$. This means that $\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is a retract of $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

For any $t \in [0,1]$ and $i = 1,\cdots,n$, put

$$H_i(P_1,\cdots,P_n,t) = A^{-t/2}P_iA^{t/2}(A^{-t/2}P_iA^{t/2} + A^{t/2}P_iA^{-t/2} - 1)^{-1}.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2, we have

$$H(P_1,\cdots,P_n,t) = (H_1(P_1,\cdots,P_n,t),\cdots,H_n(P_1,\cdots,P_n,t))$$

is a continuous mapping from $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A}) \times [0,1]$ to $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $H(P_1,\cdots,P_n,0) = (P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ and $H(P_1,\cdots,P_n,1) = r(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$. Furthermore, when $(P_1,\cdots,P_n) \in \mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $A = 1$. In this case, $H(P_1,\cdots,P_n,t) = (P_1,\cdots,P_n)$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$. Therefore, $\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is a strong deformation retract of $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

(4) Let $(P_1,\cdots,P_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Then by Corollary 3.11, there is $\delta \in (0,1/2)$ such that for any $(R_1,\cdots,R_n) \in \mathbf{P}_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $\|P_i - R_i\| < \delta$, $1 \le i \le n$, we have $(R_1,\cdots,R_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$.

Let $(R_1,\cdots,R_n) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ with $\|P_j - R_j\| < \delta$, $i = 1,\cdots,n$. put $P_i(t) = P_i$, $R_i(t) = R_i$ and $a_i(t) = (1-t)P_i + tR_i$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$, $i = 1,\cdots,n$. Then P_i, R_i, a_i are self–adjoint elements in $C([0,1],\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$ and $\|P_i - a_i\| = \max\limits_{t\in[0,1]} \|P_i - a_i(t)\| < \delta$, $i = 1,\cdots,n$. It follows from [17, Lemm 6.5.9 (1)] that there exists a projection $f_i \in C^*(a_i)$ (the C^*–subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}$ generated by a_i) such that $\|P_i - f_i\| \le \|P_i - a_i\| < \delta$, $i = 1,\cdots,n$. Thus, $\|P_i - f_i(t)\| < \delta$, $i = 1,\cdots,n$ and consequently, $F(t) = (f_1(t),\cdots,f_n(t))$ is a continuous mapping of $[0,1]$ into $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Since $a_i(0) = P_i$, $a_i(1) = R_i$ and $f_i(t) \in C^*(a_i(t))$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$, we have $f(0) = (P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ and $f(1) = (R_1,\cdots,R_n)$. This means that $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is locally path–connected.

(5) There is a continuous path $P(t) = (P_1(t),\cdots,P_n(t)) \in \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$ such that $P(0) = (P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ and $P(1) = (P'_1,\cdots,P'_n)$. By [12, Corollary 5.2.9.], there is a continuous mapping $t \mapsto U_i(t)$ of $[0,1]$ into $U(\mathcal{A})$ with $U_i(0) = 1$ such that $P_i(t) = U_i(t)P_1U_i^*(t)$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$ and $i = 1,\cdots,n$. Set

$$W(t) = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_i\Big)^{-1/2}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n P_iU_i^*(t)P_i(t)\Big)\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n U_i(t)P_iU_i^*(t)\Big)^{-1/2}$$

and $D(t) = \Big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^n P_i\Big)^{-1/2} W(t)\Big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^n U_i(t)P_iU_i^*(t)\Big)^{1/2}$, $\forall\, t \in [0,1]$. Then $W(t) \in U(\mathcal{A})$ with $W(0) = 1$, $D(t) \in GL(\mathcal{A})$ with $D(0) = 1$ and $W(t)$, $D(t)$ are all continuous on

$[0,1]$ with $D^*(t)P_iD(t)=P_i(t)$ (see the proof of (1)$\Rightarrow$(2) in Theorem 4.4), $\forall\, t\in[0,1]$ and $i=1,\cdots,n$. Put $D=D(1)$. Then $D\in GL_0(\mathcal{A})$ and $D^*P_iD=P_i'$, $i=1,\cdots,n$.

Conversely, if there is $D\in GL_0(\mathcal{A})$ such that $D^*P_iD=P_i'$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Then $U=(DD^*)^{-1/2}D\in U_0(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_iDD^*P_i=P_i$, $UP_i'U^*=(DD^*)^{1/2}P_i(DD^*)^{1/2}$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Thus, $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\sim_h(UP_1'U^*,\cdots,UP_n'U^*)$ and

$$((DD^*)^{1/2}P_1(DD^*)^{1/2},\cdots,(DD^*)^{1/2}P_n(DD^*)^{1/2})\sim_h(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$$

by Lemma 4.2. Consequently, $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\sim_h(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$. $\square$

As ending of this section, we consider following examples:

Example 4.6. Let $\mathcal{A}=\mathrm{M}_k(\mathbb{C})$, $k\geq 2$. Define a mapping $\rho\colon \mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})\to\mathbb{N}^{n-1}$ by $\rho(P_1,\cdots,P_n)=(\mathrm{Tr}(P_1),\cdots,\mathrm{Tr}(P_{n-1}))$, where $2\leq n\leq k$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)$ is the canonical trace on $\mathcal{A}$.

By Theorem 1.2, $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ means that $A=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}P_i\in GL(\mathcal{A})$ and $(A^{-1/2}P_1A^{-1/2},\cdots,A^{-1/2}P_nA^{-1/2})\in\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Put $Q_i=A^{-1/2}P_iA^{-1/2}$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Since $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_h(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)$ by Corollary 4.3, it follows that $\mathrm{Tr}(P_i)=\mathrm{Tr}(Q_i)$, $i=1,\cdots,n$ and $\mathrm{Tr}(A)=k$. Thus $\mathrm{Tr}(P_n)=k-\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n-1}P_i$.

Note that $U(\mathcal{A})$ is path–connected. So, for $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$, $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)$ and $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')$ are in the same connected component if and only if $\rho(P_1,\cdots,P_n)=\rho(P_1',\cdots,P_n')$.

The above shows that $\mathbf{PC}_k(\mathcal{A})$ is connected and $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is not connected when $k\geq 3$ and $2\leq n\leq k-1$.

Example 4.7. Let H be a separable complex Hilbert space and $\mathcal{K}(H)$ be the C^*–algebra of all compact operators in $B(H)$. Let $\mathcal{A}=B(H)/\mathcal{K}(H)$ be the Calkin algebra and $\pi\colon B(H)\to\mathcal{A}$ be the quotient mapping. Then $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is path–connected.

In fact, if $(P_1,\cdots,P_n),(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\in\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$, then we can find $(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)$, $(Q_1',\cdots,Q_n')\in\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_h(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)$ and $(P_1',\cdots,P_n')\sim_h(Q_1',\cdots,Q_n')$ by Corollary 4.3. Since $B(H)$ is of real rank zero, it follows from [17, Corollary B.2.2] or [16, Lemma 3.2] that there are projections $R_1,\cdots,R_n$ and $R_1',\cdots,R_n'$ in $B(H)$ such that $\pi(R_i)=Q_i$, $\pi(R_i')=Q_i'$, $i=1,\cdots,n$ and

$$R_iR_j=\delta_{ij}R_i,\ R_i'R_j'=\delta_{ij}R_i',\ i,j=1,\cdots,n,\ \sum_{i=1}^{n}R_i=\sum_{i=1}^{n}R_i'=I.$$

Note that $R_1,\cdots,R_n,R_1',\cdots,R_n'\notin\mathcal{K}(H)$. So there are partial isometry operators $V_1,\cdots,V_n$ in $B(H)$ such that $V_i^*V_i=R_i$, $V_iV_i^*=R_i'$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Put $V=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n}V_i$. Then $V\in U(B(H))$ and $VR_iV^*=R_i'$, $i=1,\cdots,n$. Put $U=\pi(V)\in U(\mathcal{A})$. Then $(UQ_1U^*,\cdots,UQ_nU^*)=(Q_1',\cdots,Q_n)$ in $\mathbf{PO}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Since $U(B(H))$ is path–connected, we have $(Q_1,\cdots,Q_n)\sim_h(Q_1',\cdots,Q_n')$ in $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$. Finally, $(P_1,\cdots,P_n)\sim_h(P_1',\cdots,P_n')$. This means that $\mathbf{PC}_n(\mathcal{A})$ is path–connected.

References

[1] P.E. Bjørstad and J. Mandel, On the spectra of sums of orthogonal projections with applications to parallel computing, BIT, **31** (1991), 76–88.

[2] A. Bottcher and I.M. Spitkovsky, A gentle guide to the basics of two projections theory, Linear Algebra Appl., **432** (2010), 1412–1459.

[3] D. Buckholtz, Hilber space idempotents and involutions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 128 (2000), 1415–1418.

[4] G. Chen and Y. Xue, The expression of generalized inverse of the perturbed operators under type I perturbation in Hilbert spaces, Linear Algebra Appl., **285** (1998), 1–6.

[5] J. Glimm, On a certain class of operator algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **95** (1960), 318–340.

[6] P. Halmos, Two subspace, Tran. Amer. Math. Soc., **144** (1969), 381–389.

[7] R.A. Horn and R. Johnson, Matrix Analysis, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[8] H. Lin, An Intruduction to the Classification of Amenable C^*-Algebras, World Scintific, 2001.

[9] J.J. Koliha and V. Rakočević, Invertibility of the sum of idempotents, Linear and Multilinear Algebra, 50 (2002), 285–292.

[10] J.J. Koliha and V. Rakočević, Invertibility of the difference of idempotents, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 51 (2003), 97–110.

[11] J.J. Koliha and V. Rakočević, Fredholm properties of the difference of orthogonal projections in a Hilbert space, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, 52 (2005), 125–134.

[12] N.E. Wegge–Olsen, K–Theory and C*-Algebras, A Friendly Approach, OUP, 1993.

[13] T. Shulman, On universal C^*-algebras generated by n projections with scalar sum, Amer. Math. Soc. **137**(1) (2009), 115–122.

[14] V. S. Sunder, N subspaces, Can. J. Math., XL (1) (1988), 38–54.

[15] N.L. Vasilevski, C^*–algebras generated by orthogonal projections and their applications, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, **31** (1998), 113–132.

[16] Y. Xue, The reduced minimum modulus in C^*–algebras, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, **59** (2007), 269–280.

[17] Y. Xue, Stable Perturbations of Operators and Related Topics, World Scientific, 2012.